



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,518	10/27/2003	Rikin S. Patel	014208.1636 (93-03-019)	1895
35/005 7590 05/01/2008 BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE, 6TH FLOOR DALLAS, TX 75201-2980				
EXAMINER				
CHOU, ANDREW Y				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2192				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/01/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOmail2@bakerbotts.com  
PTOmail4@bakerbotts.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/694,518

**Applicant(s)**

PATEL, RIKIN S.

**Examiner**

ANDREW CHOU

**Art Unit**

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2008.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 are pending.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 02/04/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 8 of Applicant's Remarks, Applicant contends that Ankireddipally fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "pars[ing] a plurality of transaction definitions for a software system, wherein each transaction definition comprises one or more parameters," as recited in Claim 1 of the present application.

Examiner respectfully disagrees and would like to direct Applicant's attention to Ankireddipally col. 7, lines 30-45, wherein Ankireddipally discloses parsing a plurality of operation data portions each defining an operation for a software system (the XML transaction definition document is parsed by a process automation application).

Applicant further argues that Ankireddipally fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "generat[ing] a plurality of schema definitions in response to the plurality of transaction definitions, wherein the schema definitions are written in a self-describing language", as also recited in Claim 1 of the present application. Applicant uses the reasoning that the transaction definition document disclosed in Ankireddipally cannot be equated with both the thing parsed in Claim 1 and the things generated based on the schema definitions generated in response to the parsed definitions. (Emphasis added)

Examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that the claimed language of Claim 1, lines 6-8 recites, "generate a plurality of schema definitions in response to the plurality

of transaction definitions, wherein the schema definitions are written in a self-describing language". No where does the claim language recite generating schema definitions in response to the parsed transaction definitions. Additionally, Examiner would like to point to Ankireddipally, col. 7, lines 30-45, where a XML document is provided (generated) in response to the plurality of operation data portions. (Emphasis added)

Regarding claims 12 and 22, Applicant argues that the cited portions of Ankireddipally fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the limitation: "a software service operable to receive a transaction request and to generate a first object associated with the transaction request".

Examiner respectfully disagrees and would like to direct Applicant's attention to Ankireddipally, FIG. 2, item 200, "Transaction Service", which discloses a service able to receive requests from the CXC and generates transaction definitions, see also column 11, lines 40-60.

Applicant further argues that the cited portions of Ankireddipally fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the limitation: "an object generator operable to convert the first document written in a self-describing language".

Examiner respectfully disagrees and would like to direct Applicant's attention to Ankireddipally, column 11, lines 40-60, wherein the transaction definitions (XML- self-describing language) are converted to directed acyclic graphs.

Applicant further argues that the cited portions of Ankireddipally fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the limitation: "a document generator operable to convert the first

Art Unit: 2192

document into a first transaction message according to a schema associated with a first transaction type determinable from the first document.”

Examiner respectfully disagrees and would like to direct Applicant's attention to Ankireddipally, column 11, lines 61-column 12, line 16, wherein a XML/DOM service is disclosed which is used to parse and construct XML documents.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ankireddipally et al. US 2003/0172368 A1 (hereinafter Ankireddipally).

**Claim 1:**

Ankireddipally discloses a schema generator, comprising: a computer readable storage medium (see for example FIG. 9, "item 104, "memory", and related text); computer software stored on the computer readable storage medium and operable to:

Art Unit: 2192

parse a plurality of transaction definitions for a software system, wherein each transaction definition comprises one or more parameters (see for example Abstract, and column 7, lines 30-45);

generate a plurality of schema definitions in response to the plurality of transaction definitions, wherein the schema definitions are written in a self- describing language (see for example col. 7, lines 30-45);

wherein a first schema definition is operable to map the one or more parameters associated with a first transaction definition to a first document written in the self-describing language (see for example column 10, lines 32-50, see "extracting transaction data from XML-based message ... and returning an XML document."); and

wherein a second schema definition is operable to map a second document written in the self-describing language to the one or more parameters associated with a second transaction definition (see for example column 12, lines 29-41).

**Claim 2:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the schema generator of claim 1 wherein the self-describing language comprises XML or any version thereof (see for example column 11, lines 60-66, "XML/DOM Service").

**Claim 3:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the schema generator of claim 1 wherein the self-describing language comprises HTML or any version thereof (see for example column 12, lines 1-3).

Art Unit: 2192

**Claim 4:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the schema generator of claim 1, wherein the self-describing language comprises a language that employs hypertext (see for example column 12, lines 1-3).

**Claim 5:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the schema generator of claim 1, wherein the software system comprises an IMS system (see for example FIG. 9, item 100, and related text).

**Claim 6:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the schema generator of claim 1 wherein the transaction definitions are associated with a message format service (see for example Abstract, "...manages message flow...").

**Claim 7:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the schema generator of claim 6, wherein the self-describing language comprises XML or any version thereof see for example column 11, lines 60-66, "XML/DOM Service").

**Claim 8:**

Ankireddipally discloses a method for generating a plurality of schema definitions, comprising:

parsing a plurality of transaction definitions for a software system, wherein each transaction definition comprises one or more parameters (see for example Abstract, and column 7, lines 30-45);

Art Unit: 2192

generating a plurality of schema definitions in response to the plurality of transaction definitions, wherein the schema definitions are written in a self- describing language (see for example column 12, lines 29-41);

wherein a first schema definition is operable to map the one or more parameters associated with a first transaction definition to a first document written in the self- describing language (see for example column 10, lines 32-50, see "extracting transaction data from XML-based message ... and returning an XML document."); and wherein a second schema definition is operable to map a second document written in the self-describing language to the one or more parameters associated with a second transaction definition (see for example column 12, lines 29-41, "xml").

**Claim 9:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the self- describing language comprises XML or any version thereof (see for example column 11, lines 60-66, "XML/DOM Service").

**Claim 10:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the self- describing language comprises HTML or any version thereof (see for example column 11, lines 60-66, "XML/DOM Service").

**Claim 11:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the transaction definitions are associated with a message format service (see for example Abstract, "... manages message flow...").



**Claim 12:**

Ankireddipally discloses a transaction processing system (see for example FIG. 1, and related text) comprising:

a software service operable to receive a transaction request and to generate a first object associated with the transaction request (see for example FIG. 2, item 200, "Transaction Service");

an object generator operable to convert the first object into a first document written in a self-describing language (see for example column 11, lines 40-60); and

a document generator operable to convert the first document into a first transaction message according to a schema associated with a first transaction type determinable from the first document (see for example column 11, lines 61-column 12, line 16, "XML/DOM Service").

**Claim 13:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the transaction processing system of claim 12, wherein the self-describing language comprises XML or any version thereof (see for example column 11, lines 60-66, "XML/DOM Service").

**Claim 14:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the transaction processing system of claim 12, wherein the self-describing language comprises HTML or any version thereof (see for example column 11, lines 60-66, "XML/DOM Service").

**Claim 15:**

Art Unit: 2192

Ankireddipally further discloses the transaction processing system of claim 12, wherein the transaction generator is further operable to send the first transaction message to a message format (see for example Abstract, "... manages message flow...").

**Claim 16:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the transaction processing system of claim 12, wherein the document generator is further operable to receive a second transaction message and convert the second transaction message into a second document according to a schema associated with a second transaction type determinable from the second transaction message document (see for example column 10, lines 3-17, see commerce exchange component, CXC); and wherein the second document is written in the self-describing language (see for example column 11, lines 60-66, "XML/DOM Service").

**Claim 17:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the transaction processing system of claim 16, wherein the object generator is further operable to convert the second document into a second object (see for example column 10, lines 32-50, see "extracting transaction data from XML-based message ... and returning an XML document.").

**Claim 18:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the transaction processing system of claim 17, wherein the software service is further operable to receive the second object in response to the transaction request (see for column 5, lines 47-64).

**Claim 19:**

Art Unit: 2192

Ankireddipally further discloses the transaction processing system of claim 18, wherein the self-describing language comprises XML (see for example column 11, lines 60-66, "XML/DOM Service").

**Claim 20:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the transaction processing system of claim 16, wherein the software service is further operable to receive the second document in response to the transaction request (see for column 5, lines 47-64).

**Claim 21:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the transaction processing system of claim 12, wherein the software service comprises a web service, and wherein the definition of the first object has been published in a registry (see for example FIG. 2, and related text).

**Claim 22:**

Ankireddipally discloses a method for processing a transaction, comprising:

receiving a transaction request (see for example FIG. 2, step 50, "Transaction DTD");

generating a first object associated with the transaction request (see for example FIG. 2, item 200, and related text); and

converting the first object into a first document written in a self-describing language (see for example column 10, lines 32-50, see "extracting transaction data from XML-based message ... and returning an XML document."); and

converting the first document into a first transaction message according to a schema associated with a first transaction type determinable from the first document ((see for example FIG. 3, and see for example column 10, lines 32-50, see "... returns one or

more DOM objects ... for handling as standard program objects", and related text).

**Claim 23:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the method of claim 22, wherein the self- describing language comprises XML or any version thereof (see for example column 11, lines 60-66, "XML/DOM Service").

**Claim 24:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the method of claim 22, wherein the self- describing language comprises HTML or any version thereof (see for example column 11, lines 60-66, "XML/DOM Service").

**Claim 25:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the method of claim 22, further comprising: sending the first transaction message to a message format service (see for example FIG. 2, item 200, and related text).

**Claim 26:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the method of claim 22, further comprising:  
receiving a second transaction message (see for example FIG. 2, step 50, "Transaction DTD");  
converting the second transaction message into a second document according to a schema associated with a second transaction type determinable from the second transaction message (see for example FIG. 2, item 200, and related text); and wherein the second document is written in the self-describing language (see for example column 11, lines 60-66, "XML/DOM Service").

**Claim 27:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising: converting the second document into a second object (see for example column 10, lines 32-50, see "extracting transaction data from XML-based message ... and returning an XML document.").

**Claim 28:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the method of claim 27, further comprising: receiving the second object in response to the transaction request (see for example FIG. 2, item 200, and related text).

**Claim 29:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the method of claim 28, further comprising: wherein the self-describing language comprises XML (see for example column 11, lines 60-66, "XML/DOM Service").

**Claim 30:**

Ankireddipally further discloses the method of claim 22, wherein the first object is generated by a web service and wherein the definition of the first object has been published in a registry (see for example FIG. 9, item 140, and related text).

***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2192

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

/Andrew Chou/

Examiner, Art Unit 2192

/Tuan Q. Dam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192